REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-18 remain in the application. Claims 1-18 have been amended.

In item 1 on page 2 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1, 12-15, and 18 (the Examiner has incorrectly identified claims 1 and 12-18) have been rejected as being anticipated by Wroblewski (US Pat. No. 4,908,822) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The rejection has been noted and claim 1 has been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

> a plurality of system components carrying out the same or mutually corresponding actions; and
>
> an apparatus for monitoring a proper operation of said plurality of components of the electrical system, said apparatus including:

> a plurality of dedicated monitoring devices each assigned to a respective one of the system components to be monitored, each of said dedicated monitoring devices being operable independently of the respective system component to be monitored. (Emphasis added.)

Wroblewski discloses a multiplex system for addressing, commanding, and monitoring the status of a plurality of electrical devices disposed throughout a motor vehicle.

There are two major differences between Wroblewski and the invention of the instant application:

1) According to the invention of the instant application, the plurality of system components carry out the same or mutually corresponding actions. In contrast, in Wroblewski, the plurality of electrical devices disposed throughout a motor vehicle clearly do not carry out the same or mutually corresponding actions. The examples of the electrical devices according to Wroblewski are motors, relays, and lamps, etc. (see column 2, lines 7-8).

2) According to the invention of the instant application, each of the dedicated monitoring devices is assigned to a respective one of the system components to be monitored.

In contrast, in Wroblewski, each controller is assigned to two devices (see column 2, lines 6-7).

Clearly, Wroblewski does not show "a plurality of system components carrying out the same or mutually corresponding actions; and a plurality of dedicated monitoring devices each assigned to a respective one of the system components to be monitored", as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over Wroblewski and since claims 12-15 and 18 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's statement in items 2-3 on pages 2-3 of the above-mentioned Office action that claims 2-11 and 16-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable as discussed above and claims 2-11 and 16-17 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable in dependent form. A rewrite is therefore believed to be unnecessary at this time.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-18 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 29,308

For Applicant

YC

January 26, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

RECEIVED
FEB -2 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800